

Eighth Thousand.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

BY

REV. C. F. SMARIUS, S. J.

(DECEASED.)

"The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?" *1 Cor. x: 16.*



THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY
OF AMERICA.

Pamphlet No. 17.

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA.



THE REAL PRESENCE,

BY

REV. C. F. SMARIUS, S. J.

(Deceased.)

[Reprinted from "Points of Controversy," and by permission of the Publisher, P. O'Shea, New York City.]

"The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?" 1 COR. x. 16.

[The authorized Protestant version reads as follows:

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"]

This question of the Apostle St. Paul, to the Corinthians, it is our intention to answer in the present lecture. Read the question again, so that you may understand its meaning. The Apostle asks, whether the cup of blessing, which, in those days, as in our own, was blessed by the ministers of God, is, or is not, truly, verily, substantially, the blood of Christ, so that whoever receives that cup, receives the blood of Christ; and whether the bread which is broken, is, or is not, verily and substantially, the body of the Lord; so that, whoever receives that consecrated bread, receives the body of the Lord, the very same body and blood, that were conceived of the Holy Ghost, in the Virgin's womb; the same body that suffered, and the same blood that was shed for us, from the garden to Calvary. The question here put by the Apostle, is put oratorically. There is this difference between a question, properly so

called, and the figure of speech called interrogation, that the former always implies or expresses real doubt in the mind of the questioner, whereas an interrogation expressed in a negative form, supposes not only the interrogator, but the interrogated to be thoroughly convinced of the truth or the principle, concerning which they are interrogated. This manner of impressing certain ulterior conclusions upon the mind of man, is not confined to the orator and logician. It is in daily use among all. Thus, for instance, suppose, you have laid down the principle for your children, that they shall never stay out after sunset, and it happens that one of them returns home at ten o'clock, or mid-night. What more natural for you, than to address your child as follows: Did I not tell you, my son, that every one of the children should be home at sunset? Do you ask your son this question by way of doubt? By no means; you appeal, by way of interrogation, to the conviction of his mind concerning the well-known truth, in order that you may the better impress upon him the grievousness of his offense, and the necessity of avoiding it for the future.

It was, evidently, in this sense that the Apostle St. Paul, put the question to the Corinthians. He knew full well, that they were convinced of the truth of the real presence, as explained by him, in the next chapter; he knew that they believed, as we still do, that by the words of blessing, or consecration, spoken by the priest of God, the substance of bread becomes the flesh, and the substance of wine the blood of Christ; so that, after the words of consecration, there are no longer present real bread and wine, but only the appearances of bread and wine,—there are present, truly, substantially, and really, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; the same that was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried; the same that rose again from the dead, ascended into Heaven, is there seated at the right hand of His Father, and shall thence come again, to judge the living and the dead. But, the Apostle's object was to draw from this well-known truth

some practical inferences for the Corinthians. Thence he inferred, in the first place, the necessity of their abstaining from things which were offered in sacrifice to idols; for, he concludes, "you cannot drink the chalice of the Lord and the chalice of devils; you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils." (Ibid. x. 20, 21.) Secondly, he desired to show them (as is evident from the next chapter) the sinfulness of the abuse which some of them made of their Agapes, or love-feasts, in connection with the reception of the body and blood of Christ.

"When you come, therefore, together in one place, it is not now to eat the Lord's supper. For every one taketh before his own supper to eat. And one indeed is hungry, and another is drunk."

And he concludes: "If any man be hungry, let him eat at home; that you come not together unto judgment."

It is in a similar sense that we ask and answer this question for ourselves personally, and our Catholic friends; but for the sake of our separated brethren, who deny the real presence, we ask it in doubt; and we pledge ourselves, to the best of our limited ability, to clear up their doubt, and to convince them that the doctrine of the Real Presence was always believed in the Roman Catholic Church, is clearly taught by the Scriptures, and by the fathers and doctors of Christianity throughout the Christian ages.

The Scriptural argument may be brought under three several heads.

First, Christ promised to institute the Sacrament of His body and blood.

Secondly, He instituted it.

Thirdly, St. Paul testifies to the truth of that institution.

In the first place: Our Saviour promised, in the plainest and most unmistakable terms, to institute the sacrament of His body and blood. This promise is found in St. John's Gospel, the sixth chapter.

Before entering upon a detailed proof of this proposition, it may not be amiss to remark with his eminence

Cardinal Wiseman, that "it was a practice with our Saviour, to adapt His discourse to the circumstances in which He was placed, and, more especially, to draw them from the miracles which He had wrought." If this was His practice, He could not have a "more appropriate and favorable opportunity to propound the doctrine of the Real Presence, than the miracle which He had just wrought, of feeding five thousand men, without counting the women and children, with five barley loaves, and after sating the cravings of their hunger, gathering twelve basketfuls of fragments. But before He introduces the topic of the Real Presence, He calls their attention to the necessity of believing in Him. Indeed, the doctrine of the Real Presence is of its own nature so mysterious, so impervious to human sense, that without faith in Christ, who promises and institutes it, no one could possibly accept it as an article of belief necessary unto salvation. Hence He concludes that portion of His discourse by saying: "Amen, amen, I say unto you, he that believeth in Me, hath everlasting life."

After establishing the absolute necessity of faith in Him, as the unerring Truth, who can neither be deceived Himself, nor lead others into error, He continues (vi. 48), "I am the bread of life."

The Jews, during Christ's discourse on faith in Him, had said to Him: "What sign, therefore, dost Thou show that we may see and believe Thee? What dost Thou work? Our Fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, *He gave them bread from Heaven to eat.*" Then Jesus said to them: "Amen, amen, I say unto you, Moses gave you not bread from Heaven, but My Father giveth you the true bread from Heaven." (Ibid. 30, 32.)

Now, which is that true bread which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth life to the world? Listen: "I am the bread of life."

V. 49. "Your Fathers did eat manna in the desert and they are dead."

50. "This is the bread which cometh down from Heaven, that if any man eat of it, he may not die."

51. "I am the *living* bread which came down from Heaven."

But, Lord, why hold us any longer in suspense? What meanest Thou by, "*I am the bread of life,*" and again, "*I am the living bread which came down from Heaven.*" We see Thee standing before the Jews, a true, a veritable man, made up of flesh and blood and a living soul; tell us what Thou meanest when Thou sayest, *I am the bread of life, I am the living bread.* Look at Jesus again, look at Him, as He stands there, the Son of man, the Son of Mary, with His real flesh, and His real blood, His real soul, truly God, though His divinity is hidden under His humanity, truly God as well as man; and listen:

52. "And *the bread that I will give, is my flesh* for the life of the world." It is no figurative, no symbolical flesh; it is His flesh, the very flesh, the *personal* flesh of the God-man, Jesus,—"*My flesh.*"

And well did the Jews understand Him to speak of His own, His real, His substantial, His personal flesh. For, turning Protestants at once, they strove among themselves, saying: "How can *this* man give us *His* flesh to eat?" Notice the emphasis—*this* man, the man who speaks, the man who stands before us—the man of whom they had said, a while before, "is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" (42.) How can He give us *His* flesh, His own, identical flesh, the flesh which we see, which is within the reach of our touch—how can *this* man give us His flesh to eat?

We Catholics understand the words of Christ, so far as the reality of the identical flesh of Jesus is concerned, in precisely the same way. Our separated brethren understand them in a figurative or symbolical sense. Which of us is right? Let us listen to the answer of the Saviour.

Previously, however, it is well to remark, after Cardinal Wiseman, and other controversialists, "that whenever our Lord's hearers found difficulties, or raised objections to His words, from taking them in their literal sense, while He intended them to be taken fig-

uratively, His constant practice was to explain them instantly, in a figurative manner, even though no great error could result from their being misunderstood." Thus, when Nicodemus conversed with Christ, the latter, among other things, told him: "Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be *born again*, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Nicodemus understood Christ *literally*; hence he said: "How *can* a man be born when he is old?" Our Saviour continues to explain His words in a figurative meaning, by repeating them with such a modification as could leave no further doubt of the sense in which he spoke them. "Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again of *water* and the *Holy Ghost*, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." (John, iii. 3-5. See other examples, Matt. xvi. 6; xix. 24; John, xv. 23; xi. 11; viii. 21; v. 32; v. 40; vi. 33.)

On the other hand, when His words were *rightly* understood in their literal sense, and they objected to the *doctrine* contained under the literal sense, it was His custom to stand to His words, and repeat again the very sentiment which had given offense. Thus on a certain occasion, our Lord said: "Abraham, your Father, rejoiced that he might see my day; he saw it, and was glad." His hearers understood Him to say what He meant,—that He was as old as Abraham; and murmuring, they said: "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham?" The Saviour, because they understood His words *rightly* in their literal sense, repeats the same, saying: "Amen, amen, I say unto you, before Abraham was made, I am." (John, viii. 57, 58. See other examples, Matt. ix. 2; John, vi. 42.)

Assuming these facts, as the rules for interpreting the sense of the words of Christ, in His answer, to the objections of the Jews: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" let us carefully analyze the text which follows. We shall take the text of the authorized Protestant version:

"54. Then Jesus said unto them, Amen, amen, I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you."

Does this look like a figurative presence? "Except you eat *the flesh of the Son of Man*, and drink *His blood*."

Again: "Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day; for My flesh is meat (food) indeed, and My blood is drink indeed."

How can it be food *indeed*, and drink *indeed*, if it be figurative only? Surely, symbolical or figurative flesh and blood were never food and drink *indeed*!

"57. He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me and I in him."

Could there be anything stronger than this *indwelling* of Jesus in man, and of man in Jesus?

"As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me."

We know that the Son lives by the Father in the oneness of their nature, the identity of their essence; so, in a similar manner, as far as human nature can become one with the divine nature, he who eats the flesh, and drinks the blood of Christ, becomes one with Christ, and Christ one with him. This strong expression evidently says much more than the mere moral or spiritual union, which would result from a figurative eating of the flesh, and drinking of the blood of Christ.

The fact is, the language of our separated brethren is grammatically, as well as theologically, unintelligible. They tell us, that in the Lord's Supper, the flesh of Christ is eaten figuratively by faith, which takes hold of the real body and blood of the Redeemer, through the medium of their symbols, or signs, the bread and wine. But, who ever heard of eating or drinking any real substance, figuratively, or by faith? Suppose you invite me to a dinner-party, the meats of which, you announce to me will consist of roast veal and mutton. I accept the invitation; but, behold, when I am seated at the table, I find only a piece of bread, You beg me to eat my veal, and mutton. I look around in astonishment, and my searching eye seems to ask the question: "But, where are they?" And you answer me, serious-

ly, and without a smile: "They lie before you, sir. The bread which is on your plate, is your veal, and mutton—only remember, that eating the bread, you must make up your mind, by faith, that it is meat you eat, not bread merely." Could you invent so absurd a farce as this, without laughing or smiling at your own silliness? Yet this very same thing, you tell me, the Saviour of the world did, when, by promise, and even threat, He invited and pressed us to eat His flesh, and drink His blood, which he tells us, are food and drink, *indeed*. Could any thing be more absurd, than to put a figurative construction on words so frequently, so emphatically repeated, which, of their own nature, and from the circumstances under which they are spoken, convey no other than a literal sense to the hearer and the reader?

Let us, for a moment, suppose, that Christ spoke figuratively—how, then, should we read His answer to the Jews? Our Scriptural comment would, mentally, be the following:

Verily, verily I say unto you: except ye eat (figuratively) the (figurative) flesh of the Son of Man, and drink (figuratively) His (figurative) blood, ye have no (figurative) life in you.

Whoso eateth (figuratively) My (figurative) flesh, and drink (figuratively) My (figurative) blood, hath eternal life (of course figuratively).

For My (figurative) flesh is (figurative) meat, indeed (figuratively); and My (figurative) blood is (figurative) drink, indeed (figuratively). He that eateth (figuratively) My (figurative) flesh, and drinketh (figuratively) My (figurative) blood, dwelleth (figuratively) in Me (figurative), and I (figurative) in him (figurative).

As the living Father hath sent Me (why not add, with the Socinians, figuratively!) and I live (also according to them, figuratively): so, he that eateth Me (figurative, figuratively) even he shall live (figuratively) by Me (figurative).

May we not conclude with Horace, on an other topic of absurdity, "*Risum, teneati-amici?*"

Which of you, my friends, on reading your own comment on the text of St. John's Gospel, concerning the promise of the Real Presence, can help smiling at its palpable silliness?

Still, many among you, we fear, will do as the Jews did in the synagogue at Capharnaum. Unwilling to believe, although you plainly understand the doctrine of the Saviour, your only answer is: "This is a hard saying, and who can hear it?"

Does this saying cause the Redeemer, finally, to explain Himself, in a figurative, rather than a literal sense? By no means. When He knew in Himself, that His disciples murmured at it, "He said unto them, doth this offend you? What, and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?" As though he were to say: "If now, while I am personally before you, while you can see My flesh and blood, and touch it with your hands, you are unwilling to believe Me and My words; how much more difficult will it be, when you will see Me no more; when I shall hide My flesh and blood under the appearance of bread and wine; when your sight, your taste, your touch, when all your bodily senses will be at a loss to discover the reality of My Presence; when I shall be seated at the right hand of My Father, in My Heavenly Kingdom? 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' You Jews understand My words in the literal sense in which you should understand them, so far as the reality of the flesh and blood, which I am to give you, is concerned; but you blend your carnal views with this spiritual and heavenly doctrine. You imagine that it is dead flesh and clotted gore, such as you buy in the shambles of the meat market, which I am to give you, and that it is to be eaten, after the same carnal manner, in which the cannibal devours human flesh; you are mistaken. It is the spirit which quickeneth that flesh: I shall be there, the living Christ, as you see Me now—the God-man, whom I proved Myself to be by My miracles; the flesh alone profiteth nothing. It is My soul, My Divinity, together with My flesh, which are to quicken you. which are to raise you up,

on the last day, and give you life eternal; understood in this sense, 'the words that I spake unto you, are spirit and life.'" (Ibid. 64.)

In vain does our Saviour endeavor to enlighten their darkened intellects, and to move their stubborn hearts. They reject His grace, and "from that time many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him." (Ibid. 67.)

Was it not then, at least, high time for the Teacher of all truth, to undeceive His own disciples, if they had really misunderstood His words? Did He not owe it to Himself, to His credit, as a plain, straightforward, out-spoken evangelist of the new revelation, to call them back, and to speak to them after some such fashion: "See here, my friends, you have misunderstood my meaning: you think that I meant to say, that I am about to give you, and the world that will believe in Me, My real flesh to eat, and My real blood to drink. Not so. All I wished to say was, that I shall give you a morsel of bread, and a sip of wine, which will be commemorative, symbolical, figurative of My real flesh, and My real blood, which no man shall ever eat or drink, indeed, but only by faith, in a sign, a symbol." Is He honest enough to do so? It would seem not; for, instead of calling back His sceptical disciples, He turns to the Twelve, whom He had chosen to be the columns of His Church, the apostles, the messengers, the evangelists of His new doctrine, and He says unto them: "Will you, also go away?" (Ibid. 68.) That is to say: "Rather than to change a word of what I have said; rather than sacrifice the least tittle of the truth which I have just now taught you, I am willing to sacrifice even you, and to choose others in your place, who will believe My doctrine, and My words."

Then it was, that Simon Peter, who was destined to be the head of those Apostles, the immovable rock on which Christ was to build His Church, against which the gates of hell should never prevail, anticipating the expression of the faith of his colleagues, and, as we may piously suppose, dropping on his knees, adoring that same flesh and blood, now visible before

his eyes, but soon to be hidden under the mystic veils of bread and wine, exclaimed: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." (Ibid. 69.)

Peter believed. He, no more than the rest, could fathom the depths of this stupendous mystery—he, no more than the Jews, could explain the *how*, the *manner* of the Real Presence. But, it was enough for him, that Incarnate Wisdom had spoken: he knew that, in believing Christ, he could not be deceived, though sense should fail to see, and reason to comprehend, the intrinsic nature of the mystery. Blessed wert thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed these things to thee, but the Father of that same Christ, who is in Heaven. Blessed still, all they, who, like Peter, have not seen, and have yet believed.

What the Saviour so clearly and solemnly promised, He, with equal accuracy and solemnity fulfilled.

It was the eve of His cruel passion. The gloom of Gethsemani and Calvary was already upon His soul. He spoke of His being betrayed by one of His disciples; of His not drinking of the fruit of the vine till He should drink it new in the kingdom of His Father. He had eaten the Passover, the Paschal lamb, with His Apostles. He had washed their feet, and now, seated once more at table, "while they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed and broke, and gave to His disciples, and said: Take ye and eat. *This is My body*. And taking the chalice, He gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this; *for this is My blood* of the new Testament, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins." (Matt. xxvi. 26-28.)

How shall we construct an argument on these words of the Saviour? They are so plain, so simple, they carry their own conviction with them in the bare reading, for all those who are not wilfully blind, and incorrigibly obstinate. Recall the fact that the Apostles had heard the full explanation of the words of the promise. They had remained faithful. When others refused to believe, they, through Peter, had made an open profession of their belief in the future institution of the

Eucharist; all they expected was the fulfilment of the promise, that their Master would give them His flesh to eat, and His blood to drink. That Master is now on the eve of His death. He is about to make His last will, or testament. It was now no time to speak in figures or parables. A dying man does not busy himself with the language of poetry or rhetoric. If ever, it is then he speaks in plain, unvarnished prose, which every one can understand. Moreover, those who hear the Saviour on this solemn occasion, are simple, uneducated fishermen. They can scarcely understand the commonest expressions of their own language. Their reason, like their speech, is untutored, and uncultivated. They would scarcely think of such nice distinctions as the difference, in a given instance, between a figurative and a literal expression of speech. How much less were they capable of nicely sifting out the certainly concealed figurative expression of Christ's thought, which our separated brethren appear to have discovered in the text. If what we have premised seems plausible, then I ask you, how, think you, did the Apostles understand the words of Christ above cited? Think you they understood them to mean what they obviously, and on first hearing of them, convey to the mind, or the very opposite? If the former, then they believed Christ to have changed the bread, which He broke, into the real, substantial flesh of His own personal body, and the wine, which He blessed, into His own real and personal blood; and, consequently, they believed in what we call transubstantiation, and the Real Presence. And how could they believe otherwise? They had heard Him say that He would give them His flesh *to eat*, and His blood *to drink*; for that His flesh was food indeed and His blood was drink indeed. Now they hear him say—take ye, *eat ye*; this is *My body*. *Drink ye* all of this: this is *My blood*. True, they had heard from His lips—I am the door, the vine; the field is the world; and the like figurative expressions; but what resemblance could they discover between those obviously metaphorical sayings, and the words: this is *My body*; this is *My blood*? To do so they must have been

immediately struck with the perfect parallelism not only of the words, but of the things. Where is that similarity? Not surely in the fact that bread was a well known type or figure of the human body; for whoever heard that bread was assumed as an object of similarity or resemblance with the human body? Certainly, Christ's body did not in any imaginable way resemble bread—nor could bread in any possible way represent His body. Christ's words were, therefore, understood by the Apostles in their literal sense.

Moreover, Christ, as St. Luke says, added to the words "this is My body" which is delivered for you," "this is My blood which shall be shed for you." (Luke, xxii. 19, 20.) Did not Christ give His real, substantial flesh, shed His real, substantial, personal blood for us? And yet it is that flesh, of which He says: "Take ye, and eat;" it is that blood of which he says: "Drink ye all of it."

Let us illustrate the whole argument by an example. Suppose you are father of a family, and about to die. You wish to make your last will in behalf of your children. In the presence of the notary public and two witnesses you dictate as follows: "To my daughter Mary, I leave this house with all its appurtenances. To my daughter Sarah, I leave the block of houses situated on Verona street. To my son John, I leave my farm of 150 acres, and all the improvements on the same." Suppose further that you are dead, and that your children go to the Probate Court to settle the question of their inheritance. There they are told by the judge: "Well, Mary, you doubtless imagine that your father left you the real, substantial brick-and-mortar house in which he died?" "Most certainly, your honor," replies the girl. "Yet, I am sorry to say," returns the judge, "that you are mistaken. The words of the last will of your father mean, that sometime before he fell sick, he had a photograph taken of his house, which must be somewhere hanging or lying in a room, and that is the portion of your inheritance." "As to your share, Sarah, he left you a birdseye-view of the block of houses mentioned in the codicil, which,

upon diligent search, you will probably find somewhere in the house." "To you, John, he left a landscape-view of the farm and its scenery, which you will find in some corner of the attic or the garret." Now, suppose these children go home in search of their respective heirlooms, and hug them to their bosoms, as a rich fortune left them by their departed father; would you not say, that both the judge and the children, had lost their senses? Yet this is what our good friends have done. During sixteen hundred years the Church of Rome had never ceased to transmit to her dear children the legacy which she herself had received on the eve of the death of her divine spouse; His flesh as food, His blood as drink for their hungry souls. Then come Carlstadt and Zwingle, and tell these children: "Your mother and you are mistaken: Christ, her spouse, did not leave her or you His real flesh, as food, nor His real blood, as drink; but only a piece of bread and a sip of wine, as the images, the signs, the symbols, the figures of His real flesh and blood." Which, think you, is right, the Church or the sacramentarians; Rome or Zwingle?

Our separated brethren cannot but admit, that, whether real or figurative, Christ instituted a new rite; propounded, on that occasion a new law; inculcated a new practice, to be kept by the faithful throughout all time. But, it would be unreasonable to suppose, that a wise and prudent lawgiver would make use of terms which would be open to cavil, on account of their vagueness and ambiguity. That is contrary to all experience; much less could that be supposed of our Saviour, on so important a subject, and on so solemn an occasion. Now, it is evident, that the whole terminology of the Redeemer, from the words of the promise to those of the institution, as related by the several evangelists, favors the Roman Catholic, rather than the Protestant interpretation; so, that nothing less than the most ingenious sophistry could possibly construct an argument on those words, which would incline us to think that He spoke figuratively, rather than literally. Nor did our Divine Saviour, as on other occasions, when He was

misunderstood, vouchsafe an explanation, which could induce His Apostles to believe the words in any other than the literal and obvious sense, which they, at first sight, convey. Every reason therefore, compels us to believe, that Christ, at the Last Supper, gave His Apostles His real flesh to eat, and His real blood to drink.

Nor did He stop here. He, moreover, added: "Do this for a commemoration of me." (Luke, xxii. 19.) Our Lord, then, commanded His Apostles to do the very same thing that they had seen Himself do. What had He done? He had taken bread, and blessed it, and in the blessing, made it His own body, and given it as food to them. In the same manner, He had taken the chalice, blessed it, and made it His blood, giving it to them as drink; He commands them to do the very same. *This*, namely, that you have seen Me do, do ye, for a commemoration of Me. In what that commemoration was chiefly to consist, we are told by the Apostle St. Paul, who writes: "for as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord, until He come." (1 Cor. xii. 26.) The unbloody presence of Christ in the sacrament, under the appearances of bread and wine, was, then, to be a memorial, commemorative of the bloody presence of Jesus on the cross; and the invisible reality of the one, the memorial of the visible reality of the other.

We now proceed to the testimony of St. Paul, who, though he was present neither at the promise nor at the institution of the sacrament, bears the most striking evidence in the case. Besides the text which we have already quoted, in which he says: "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ; and the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" he writes as follows, in the eleventh chapter:

"For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread,

"And giving thanks, broke, and said: Take ye and eat: this is My body, which shall be delivered for you; this do for the commemoration of Me.

"In like manner, also, the chalice, after He had supped, saying: This chalice is the new Testament in My blood: this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of Me.

"For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord, until He come.

"Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.

"But, let a man prove himself; and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice.

"For, he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment [Protestant version, damnation] to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord." (1 Cor. xi. 23-29.)

Observe first that Saint Paul repeats the formula of the institution, in nearly the very same words in which it is recorded by the Evangelists. If St. Paul understood those words in a figurative sense, how comes it, that he does not give a turn to his phraseology which would express that figurative sense? Did not honesty require him to do it; the more so, as he was instructing a promiscuous multitude of church members, many of whom, were, perhaps, less capable of finding a figurative sense under these words, than were the Apostles themselves? Moreover, he wrote after the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles, and he himself was imbued with the same Spirit, so that his understanding, now, at least, was fully opened to the real sense of the doctrines of Christ.

But how will you explain in a figurative sense, the following strong language of the Apostle to the Corinthians? "Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, if there are no such body and blood, as our separated brethren teach? It is true, there would still be the symbols, the signs, the images; but will anyone say that whoever is guilty of an outrage or assault upon a portrait or image of the king, is really and actually guilty of an

assault upon his person? Yet this is the strength of St. Paul's expression, which cannot possibly be understood, except on the Catholic ground, that under the appearances of bread and wine, Christ's body and blood are really, substantially and personally present.

The same must be said of the following: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord." (Ibid. 29.) What more fearful punishment could be inflicted in consequence of any crime than eternal damnation? The crime, then, of eating and drinking unworthily, must be an exceedingly outrageous one. But this extraordinary degree of guilt can scarcely be incurred in profaning the mere symbols or signs of Christ's body; for then there would have been the same reason for punishing the Jews, if they had eaten the Paschal lamb or manna unworthily, since both these were types and symbols, even more striking and impressive, than those which the Saviour instituted. The only way, therefore, to account for this severity, is the reason given by the Apostle: because those who eat and drink unworthily, do not discern the body of the Lord: that is, they profane the body of the Lord, really present in the sacrament. It is true, that the Apostle mentions the words bread and wine in connection with the subject, but that fact is easily accounted for; first, because this form of language is familiar to the penmen of Holy Writ. Thus the rod of Aaron was still called rod after it had been changed into a serpent (Exod. vii. 12), and in the New Testament the *blind* are said to *see*. Men are called blind after sight is restored to them (Matt. xi. 5; Luke, viii. 22.) Secondly, we often name things by appearances, the shape, and color, which they present. Thus, angels are often called *men*, in the Scriptures. (Gen. xviii. 2; Josh. v. 13; Dan. ix. 21; Acts, i. 10.) These modes of expression are adopted in order to avoid a repetition of the same phraseology; thus, in verse 27, the Apostle would have written: Therefore, whosoever shall eat this body or drink this blood of the Lord, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord. Nor

was there any longer the same danger, as at the institution, of being misunderstood. The doctrine of the Real Presence was already established; its practice had been in existence for twenty-four years, so that the faithful fully understood the sense in which the Apostle used the words bread and wine, in connection with this mystery.

It now remains for us briefly to show how this doctrine has been uniformly taught and believed throughout the Catholic Church ever since the commencement of Christianity. St. Ignatius, the Martyr, who was a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, and bishop of Antioch, speaking of the Gnostics of his time, writes: "They abstain from the Eucharist, because they do not acknowledge it to be the flesh of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father, by His goodness, resuscitated. (Epis. ad Smyrn.)

According to this Father of the Church, it was a heresy, an error, not to believe in the Real Presence.

St. Justin, the Philosopher, suffered martyrdom at Rome, about the year 166. He says: "As Jesus Christ, made man by the word of God, took flesh for our salvation, in the same manner, we have been taught that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of the words that He spoke, and by which our blood and flesh, in the change, are nourished, *is the flesh and blood of that Jesus incarnate*. (Apol. i., ad imper. Anton.) St. Justin does not look upon the fact which he sets forth in his Apology as a mere opinion, but as a real dogma of the Church: "We have been taught." What that dogma was, is too plain to need any comment.

St. Irenæus, expostulating with the heretics of his day, says: "How can they prove that the bread, over which the words of thanksgiving have been pronounced, *is the body of their Lord*, and the cup *His blood*," while they do not admit that He is the Son; that is, the Word of the Creator of the world? (Advers. Hær., lib. iv.)

How could these men, St. Ignatius at Antioch, Justin

at Rome, Irenæus at Lyons, agree so accurately on the same doctrine, if it was not the doctrine of the Universal Church!

St. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, in the fourth century, writes:

"There is no room to doubt the truth of Christ's flesh and blood; for now, by the profession of the Lord Himself, and according to our belief, it is truly flesh and truly blood." (De Trin., lib. viii.)

St. Ephrem, of Edessa, says: "*His body*, by a new method, is mixed with our bodies, and *His most pure blood* is transfused into our veins. *He is wholly incorporated with vs.*" (Hymn xxxiv., de Virginitate.)

And again: "Believe, then, and with a firm faith receive *the body and blood of our Lord*. Abraham placed earthly food before the celestial spirits, of which they ate. This was wonderful. But what Christ has done for us greatly exceeds this and transcends all speech and all conception. To us that are in the flesh, He has given to eat *His body and blood*." (De Nat. Dei, tom. iii.)

But nothing could be clearer than the testimonies of St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, in his catechetical explanations on this subject:

"The bread and wine, which, before the invocation of the adorable Trinity, were nothing but bread and wine, become, after this invocation, the body and blood of Christ." (Cat. Mystag., i., N. iii.) "The Eucharistic bread, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer common bread, but the body of Christ." (Ibid., Cat. iii., N. iii.)

"The doctrine of the blessed Paul alone is sufficient to give certain proof of the truth of the divine mysteries; and you, being deemed worthy of them, are become one body and one blood with Christ. For this great Apostle says: That our Lord, in the same night wherein He was delivered, having taken bread, and given thanks, broke it, and gave it to His disciples, saying to them—take and eat, this is My body. Afterwards He took the cup, and said: take and drink, this is My blood. As then Christ, speaking of the bread, declared,

and said: '*This is My body;*' who shall dare to doubt it? And, as speaking of the wine, He positively assured us, and said: '*This is My blood;*' who shall doubt it, and say that it is not His blood?" (Cat. Mystag., iv., N. i.)

How beautifully and forcibly the same holy Father refutes the objection, which the unbeliever and those who deny this Christian doctrine make to the possibility of this mystery, may be learned from the following passage:

"Jesus Christ, at Cana, of Galilee, once changed water into wine by His will only; and shall we think Him less worthy of credit, when He changes wine into blood? Invited to an earthly marriage, He wrought that miracle; and shall we hesitate to confess, that He has given to His children His body to eat, and His blood to drink? Wherefore, with all confidence, let us take the body and blood of Christ. For in the type or figure of bread His body is given to thee; and in the type or figure of wine His blood is given; that so being made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, you may become one body and one blood with Him. Thus, the body and blood of Christ being distributed in our members, we become *Christophori*, that is, we carry Christ with us; and thus, as St. Peter says, we are made partakers of the divine nature." (Ibid., N. iii.)

"Wherefore I conjure you, my brethren, not to consider them [bread and wine] any more as common bread and wine, since they are the body and blood of Jesus Christ, according to His words; and although your sense may suggest that to you, let faith confirm you. Judge not of the thing by your taste, but, by faith; assure yourself, without the least doubt, that you are honored with the body and blood of Christ. This knowing, and of this being assured, that what appears to be bread, is not bread, though it be taken for bread by the taste, but is the body of Christ; and that which appears to be wine, is not wine, though the taste will have it so, but is the blood of Christ." (Ibid., N. iv., v., vi., ix.)

Could human language be stronger or clearer to prove to neophytes, to those who have just been received into the Church by baptism, the reality of Christ's flesh and blood in the Eucharist? Remember, such was the faith of the whole Christian Church during the fourth century. Who, then, are the innovators, the Catholics, or the so-called reformers of the sixteenth century? Instead of believing as the latter did, that Christ's body is present figuratively, typically, in real bread, and His blood figuratively and typically in real wine, those Christians were taught that Christ's real body was present in typical bread, and His blood in typical wine, because they believed, that after the words of blessing, or, as we generally express it, after the consecration, the substance of the bread and wine has become the body and blood of Jesus Christ, so that the appearances only of bread and wine remain.

Add to these testimonies, a well-known fact, in the history of the first four centuries of Christianity; namely, the discipline of secrecy (*disciplina arcani*), which was practised by the Church in the celebration of her mysteries, especially the mystery of the Eucharist. What reason or motive could the primitive Church have had for celebrating, with closed doors the mysteries of the altar, if she had not believed in the Real Presence? Why should her writers have been so careful in speaking of this mystery in such of their works as were destined to be made public? Why were catechumens and unbelievers forbidden to remain in the houses of assembly, when the mystic offering was about to commence? Why did the Apologists of the Catholic religion abstain from plainly and openly stating the nature of these mysteries? Why did they allege, as a reason for their not divulging them, the command of their Master, that pearls should not be cast before dogs and swine? Why did, even, the martyrs, when they were put to the rack for practising in private cruel and bloody crimes, such as feasting upon the flesh of a newborn babe, content themselves with denying the accusation, without explaining the real nature of the practise for which they were condemned? Can you account

for these facts on the supposition, that they believed in the figurative presence only? What was there so mysterious, so sacred, in the practise of eating a bit of bread, and drinking a sip of wine, in remembrance of the Saviour, who had, Himself, done so on the eve of His death, and ordered His followers to do the same? Was there any danger of ridicule or calumny on that score, from their most bitter and inveterate enemies? Was there any danger of persecution unto death for following a doctrine and a practise which had nothing in it contradicting sense? No, my friends; this secrecy, so stubbornly maintained in the midst of the jeers of infidel writers; in the midst of the most cruel persecutions of tyrants, can be accounted for only on the hypothesis, that the first Christians believed in the real presence, whose sublime doctrines were too profound for carnal-minded men; whose nature was too sacred and holy to be exposed to the impious sneers of godless antagonists.

To suppose, as some of our adversaries have done, that the doctrine of the Real Presence was gradually introduced into the Church of Rome, is a hypothesis opposed alike to fact and reason. That it is opposed to fact, we have already proved, by citing the testimonies of the leading writers of the first ages of Christianity. Nor is there any reason for admitting such a supposition.

But, if the Church of Rome had introduced this doctrine into her creed, how comes it that her enemies not only never objected this fact to her, but retained the same doctrine when they left her bosom? How comes it that Nestorius, who apostatized from Rome in the fourth century, carried with him the doctrines and practices of the Church concerning the Real Presence? How do you account for its existence among the Eutychians, Jacobites, Copts, or Syrians? Why did not the Greek schismatics, who quarreled with Rome about trifles, remonstrate with her on the score of the Real Presence? How will you make this universal agreement of all the churches, during one thousand years, tally with your assumption, that it was gradually introduced into the Church?

To introduce a new doctrine into the Church, especially a doctrine which, according to our adversaries themselves, is too deep for human wit, and impervious to human sense, would require more ingenuity and craft than the keenest intellect is capable of. By what process of sophistry could any individual, or individuals, however gifted, have convinced millions of Christians, that bread could, by a few words spoken over it, become the flesh, and wine the blood of the Son of God? No matter how gross the ignorance of the multitude, no matter how dark the age in which they lived, can we believe that there would have been no opposition made, no remonstrance uttered against the novelty! Ignorance favors self-interest, passion, sensuality, ambition; but, what was ignorance to gain by the doctrine of the Real Presence? A hidden God not only to be adored, but to be received in the Eucharist, humbles human pride, because it confounds human reason; requires the sacrifice of pride and sensuality, as a necessary disposition, to receive Him worthily. Moreover, universal ignorance is a chimera. There never was an age, there can be none, so entirely dark as not to possess any light at all. This is certainly true of the successive ages of the Christian era. Would no one see—no one expose the novelty? When other heresies sprang up, the learned doctors of the Church arose at once, and, with prolific pens, asserted the majesty and power of the ancient truth, against the abject slavery and weakness of error; and was there none to wield that same pen against the daring innovator, who, for the first time since the foundation of Christianity, taught the mysterious doctrine of the Real Presence? No, not one; or if there was, let his name be given—his arguments made known. On the contrary, no sooner did Berengarius, in the eleventh century, deny the doctrine of the Real Presence, than the whole Christian Church rose up to refute and condemn his innovation. Learned bishops and doctors, like Lanfranc, Quitmond, Algerus, and others, overwhelmed him with argument, and no fewer than fifteen Councils, solemnly anathematized him. The uninterrupted and undisturbed possession,

therefore, of this doctrine by the Church of Rome during sixteen centuries, previous to the so-called Reformation, is a demonstrative argument, that the doctrine is a doctrine of Christ, and that, therefore, it forms a part of that creed which it is necessary to believe unto salvation.

Luther himself, eagerly as he desired to do away with this doctrine, never denied the Real Presence, yea, denounced, with his usual violence and vulgarity, the Zwinglians, who taught the figurative presence. "I clearly saw," says he, "how much I should thereby" (viz., by overthrowing the Real Presence) "injure Popery; but I found myself caught, without any way of escaping; for, the text of this Gospel was too plain for this purpose." (Epist. ad Argent.) Of the Zwinglians, he writes: "The devil seems to have mocked those to whom he has suggested a heresy so ridiculous, and contrary to Scripture, as that of the Zwinglians." And, speaking of their comments on the words, "this is My body, this is My blood," he remarks, that "their translations and glosses on these texts have as much sense, as if one should translate the first words of Genesis: '*In the beginning God created heaven and earth*'—*In the beginning the cuckoo eat the sparrow and his feathers.*" (Def. Verb. Dom.)

Furthermore, he calls those who deny the Real Presence, "a reprobate sect, lying heretics, bread-breakers, wine-drinkers, and soul-destroyers." (In Parv., Cat.) "They are indevilized and superdevilized"—they have the devil in them, and above them. Finally, he devotes them all to the flames of hell.

The authorized Catechism of the Church of England, declares that, "the body and blood of Christ are *verily* and *indeed* taken"—and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. But it may be said: We have changed all this; we no longer believe as did Luther, or such lights of the Establishment as Ridley, Hooker, Andrew, Casaubon, Montague, Belson, Taylor, Forbes, Cosin, Samuel Parker, and others. And yet it is certain, my friends, that the truth of Christ's religion changeth not. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My word shall

not pass away," "Christ—yesterday, to-day, and the same forever." You must needs conclude, that either Luther, and the Anglican Church, were wrong when they taught the Real Presence, or else, that you yourselves are wrong, in denying it. And, in either instance, your Reformation was not, and could not be, the work of God; nor your pretended Christianity, the Christianity of Christ; for Christianity knows no change.

Here we might, strictly speaking, leave the matter. For, writing as we do, for Christians, we have appealed to such proofs of the Real Presence, as they, in virtue of their own principles, are bound to receive as conclusive evidence in the case. According to our separated brethren, the Bible is the only rule of the Christian's faith. We have appealed to that Bible for any evidence of a figurative presence in the Eucharist. In strict logic, the question is here at an end. Consistently with their own principles, they cannot claim a change of ground in the argumentation. But consistency is a jewel, whose precious worth our adversaries do not always properly value. Defeated in their encounter on the field of the Scriptures, they retreat into the byways of infidelity—into the haunts of sense, and the dark rocks of solitary reason. Conquered by the sword of the Spirit, they grasp the dagger of the impious. Abandoning Saints Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul, they appeal to Hobbes, Paine, Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau, Bratscheider, and Wegschneider, for weapons of attack against the Church, and her doctrine of the Real Presence.

Boasting no longer of the Bible as their only guide to faith, they set up reason and the senses as the sole judges competent to decide the question of the Eucharist, and with greater pomp of speech than show of reason, they object to our doctrine as follows:

"The phenomenal only can lead us to the knowledge of the real; but the phenomena of the Eucharist present only bread and wine; therefore, the Eucharist contains but bread and wine."

Stripping the objection of all the accoutrements of language, they mean to say: "Nothing is true to us

but what we know by the aid of the senses; but by the aid of the senses we discover in the Eucharist only bread and wine; therefore, in truth, there are but bread and wine in the Eucharist."

If our adversaries are really convinced of the truth of the principle laid down in the above premises, then I fear that logic will lead them further than they imagine or wish.

Is it true, that we are not capable of coming to the knowledge of truth save by the aid of our bodily senses; that is to say, unless we see, hear, taste, touch, or smell, the objects of our knowledge? If so, my friends, then you must deny not only the doctrine of the Real Presence, but the very first and fundamental doctrines of Christianity itself; then you must not only borrow arguments from, but take side with the infidel against the Christian religion and its doctrines. Are you a Trinitarian, that is, do you believe in one God and three persons? By the aid of which of your five bodily senses have you come to know that mystery? Have you ever seen, heard, tasted, smelled, or touched the triune nature of the Deity? If not, then, according to your own showing, you must deny the Trinity and become a Deist. Do you believe in the Divinity of Jesus Christ? Have you ever seen, heard, tasted, smelled, or touched the mystery of His incarnation? If not, then renounce His Divinity, and take your stand on the platform of the Socinian. Do you believe in baptism as the sacrament of regeneration, by which, from children of wrath, we become the children of God,—by which we pass from the state of sin to that of righteousness? Has any one of your senses penetrated the mystery of that regeneration? Not your eyes, for they saw at most the effusion of a certain quantity of water upon the body, and not the interior cleansing or purification of the soul from sin. Much less did you discover that mystery by any one of the other bodily senses. You are bound to go further still, in virtue of your principle. Have you ever seen God? Have you ever heard Him, tasted Him, smelled Him, touched Him? If not, then farewell not only to Christianity, but to Deism, and

profess yourself, at once, an Atheist. Hail infidelity, with all its fearful consequences for time and for eternity?

When or where did Christ teach that our senses are to be the guides to our faith? Did He not rebuke Thomas Didymus, because he made those senses the conditions of his faith in the resurrection? "Except I shall *see* in His hands the print of the nails, and *put my finger* into the place of the nails, and *put my hand* into His side, I will not believe." (Jo. xx. 25.) And when our Saviour had allowed him the privilege of seeing and touching the prints of the nails and the wound of the side, what does he add: "Because thou hast seen Me, Thomas, thou hast believed: *blessed are they that have not seen, and have believed.*" (Ibid. 29.)

Our friends confound faith with knowledge. We are not asked to know, either in virtue of the testimony of our senses, or the intuitions or argumentative processes of reason, the nature of any mystery or doctrine of religion; but we are commanded to receive its truth upon the unerring testimony of the God-man, who can neither be deceived Himself, nor deceive us. The mysteries of faith are to be believed by us not on the evidence of the senses or of reason, but on the evidence of the fact of their revelation. We must not ask, "Can I see?" or even "Can I understand what I am asked to believe?" but, "*is it revealed?*" It is a fact that Jesus Christ has taught those mysteries. When I have convinced myself of that fact, I follow the example of St. Peter: I bow my stubborn neck under the sweet yoke of faith, and I exclaim: "Lord, I believe: for to whom shall we go if not to Thee, who hast the words of eternal life?"

"But my senses are deceived in this mystery. I see, taste, and touch only bread and wine; and I am made to believe there is neither bread nor wine, but the body and blood of Christ."

Suppose, for argument's sake, that your senses are deceived. It would not be the first, nor probably the last time in your life and experience. Are there no

instances in which the bare testimony of your senses must be corrected by the dictates of your reason, enlightened by science? When you judge that the oar of the boatman is not bent, as it appears to be, under the water, do you rely for your judgment on the testimony of your sight only? Witnessing the setting of the sun, you would say that the king of day descends in a line with your eyes, while philosophy teaches you that he has sunk already several degrees below the horizon.

Instances of the deception of the senses are numerous in the Scriptures. When Abraham entertained the three angels in the Vale of Mambre, and gave them to eat, were not his eyes deceived concerning their real nature? (Gen. xviii.) When Jacob wrestled with the angel who touched the sinew of his thigh, were not both his sight and touch deceived concerning the real substance of the spirit? (Gen. xxxii.) When, in the field of the city of Jericho, Josue saw a man standing over against him with a drawn sword, was he to believe the testimony of his eyes only, and refuse to believe that it was an angel? How, guided by his senses of sight or hearing only, could he fall on his face to the ground, and worshipping say: "What saith my Lord to his servant?" (Josue, v. 13, 15.) Were the Jews excusable for not believing in the divinity of Jesus Christ, when their senses reported Him only as the carpenter's son, the son of Joseph and Mary. Were not the eyes of the disciples bound, so that they should not know Jesus, when they were going to Emmaus? Did their ears perceive by the sound of His voice that it was He, while "He expounded to them, in all the scriptures, the things that were concerning Him?" (Luke, xxiv. 27) Did not Mary Magdalene see Jesus standing at the sepulchre, and yet knew not that it was Jesus, but believed Him to be the gardener? (Jo. xx. 15.)

In all these instances the manner of appearing was evidently different from His usual, His natural way, so that, till He resumed His natural appearance, voice, etc., they did not recognize Him by the aid of their

senses. And yet during all that time, He was substantially the same Jesus, who walked among them, who spoke to them, on other occasions. You are all acquainted with the Saviour's transfiguration on mount Thabor. Suppose that the Apostles Peter, John, and James, had not accompanied their Master on that occasion, but, without any previous knowledge of His presence, had come to the the mountain, while His garments were white like snow, and His countenance shone like the sun; is it probable that they would have recognized Him? And yet, if they had been told then to make an act of faith in the reality of His presence on the mountain, could they have refused to do so with impunity, merely because their eyes did not see Jesus in His usual natural form? Why, then, should you or I refuse to believe Him really present under the appearances of bread and wine, when we are plainly told by Him that He is really and truly present under the accidents or appearances of bread and wine? Is not Jesus now seated at the right hand of His Heavenly Father—the same Jesus who was born of the Virgin, and died upon the cross? Are you not bound to believe this truth as an article of the Christian faith? Yet, every one of your bodily senses fails to prove it—faith, in this case, as in the case of the Real Presence in the sacrament, supplies the defect of the senses.

But you tell me, human reason cannot understand how it is possible, that bread and wine should be changed into the body and blood of Jesus. Do you mean to say, that we are to believe only what reason can comprehend and fathom? Then, why do you believe any mystery of religion at all? Can your reason understand *how* there are three distinct persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in one and the same undivided and indivisible Godhead; so that the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Holy Ghost, nor the Holy Ghost the Father or the Son, and yet all three are God, and have one and the same identical essence? Is it more easy for reason, to understand, *how* God drew all existing substances out of nothing, than how He changes one substance into another? Can you explain the mir-

aculous change of water into wine, at the feast of Cana in Galilee, more clearly and definitely than the change of bread into flesh, or wine into blood? How do you account for the mystery of the incarnation, of the union of two distinct natures and wills, in one and the same hypostasis, or person? How do you account for the action of justifying grace in the human soul; yea more, how do you account for the actions of the soul on the human body? Are not all these secrets, which it is not given to the human mind to discover? And indeed, where would be the merit of our faith, if we could fathom all its objects, by the aid, either of our bodily senses, or the faculties of our mind? We should no longer believe, but know; and knowledge, as such, was never required unto salvation; but faith, which, as the Apostle says, is "the substance of things to be hoped for; the evidence of things that appear not." (Heb. xi. 1)

Our separated brethren forget that, in their anxiety to refute the doctrine of the Real Presence, they furnish their own coreligionists with weapons which, like a two-edged sword, cut both ways, and prove as fatal in causing them to reject all other mysteries of faith, as to reject the Real Presence. We acknowledge that the testimony of the senses, applied to their proper objects, in a proper way, is an infallible criterion of truth; and that reason, within her sphere, can decide with infallible certitude, upon all truths that belong to that sphere; but we deny that either of them was intended as the infallible criterion or judge of all truth. There are many things in Heaven and on earth, which man has not dreamed of in his philosophy; many, with the nature, the manner of which, he will never be acquainted, until the veil is withdrawn; until faith is changed into vision.

Nor are our senses, properly speaking, deceived in relation to the Real Presence. The senses of men are the organs of their rational soul, and receive those impressions only, of which by their nature, they are capable. The eye sees the shape, color, form; the taste relishes the sweetness, etc., of the bread and wine; and they convey those impressions to the mind. Ordinarily

speaking, the mind would thence infer that the sensations received from the external qualities, must lead her to judge the substances to be bread and wine; but instructed by faith, she corrects her judgment, and pronounces them, what they really are, the body and blood of Christ. Thus both have done their naturally appointed duty; the senses have reported the outward appearances, and outward qualities of the substance, and the mind yielding to the higher authority of faith, has pronounced the substance flesh and blood.

It would be ridiculous to argue from the exception to a general conclusion, as some of our adversaries do: If this is so, they tell us, with regard to the Eucharist, then we can *never* trust our senses nor our reason. You might as well say, that if you believe that Christ raised Lazarus from the dead, all the dead will rise from their graves and repeople the earth. Exceptions do not destroy, but strengthen the general rule, by the very contrast which they present.

Equally impertinent is the question, "How can the body of Christ be present in so small a space as is occupied by a wafer, and in so many different wafers, at the same time?"

Natural philosophers might answer you, that all the matter contained in the universe might be reduced to an indefinitely smaller space, and according to Newton, to no more than a cubic inch; but we forbear recurring to the known laws of matter, to prove a mystery, for the truth of which the word of God alone is and ought to be sufficient evidence. When we speak of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, under the sacramental veil of bread and wine, we speak not of a natural, but a miraculous, a preternatural presence, with which the laws of nature have, simply nothing to do. The physical impossibility cannot certainly be greater than would be the moral impossibility, that Jesus Christ should tell a lie, as He most evidently did, if we are to take His words to mean what they plainly signify to the mind. Nor is it necessary to allege the authority of certain modern writers, such as Robert Dale Owen, and others, to prove that bilocation, or

the presence of the same individual in two places, at the same time, is not only possible, but is proved to have been a fact; suffice it to say, that the state and conditions of a spiritualized, or glorified body, such as Christ's is after His resurrection, cannot be adequately judged of by the knowledge we have of the conditions of a body in its natural state. Certain it is, as every Bible reader admits, that the same Jesus, who remains forever seated at the right hand of His Father, appeared, at the same time, to St. Paul, on the road to Damascus, and stood by him, in the castle of Jerusalem. (Acts, ix. 17; xxiii. 11.) What has happened before, is not impossible now, and may happen in the same or another form, again.

"But, to say the least, you do not carry out the whole doctrine of the Real Presence, as propounded by its divine Author, and you shamefully wrong the people, by withholding from them the cup—administering the sacrament under the appearance of bread only."

To this we answer, that, when the Saviour instituted this wonderful sacrament, none but His Apostles were present at the Supper, and none but they received the Holy Communion. It is true they received under both species, and were ordered to receive under both species. But this was natural and reasonable. For, by the words which He subjoined to the formula of consecration: "Do this for a commemoration of Me" (Luke, xxii, 19), He made them priests forever, according to the order of Melchisedec, and commanded them to offer the same unbloody sacrifice, in the same manner, in which they had seen Him offer. As priests, and therefore, as sacrificators, it was necessary that their sacrificial act should show the nature of real sacrifice. Now, sacrifice is defined to be the offering of a sensible thing, which, with mystic rites, is consecrated, and changed, by a lawful minister, and made to God alone, thereby to acknowledge His supreme dominion over all things. Hence, to represent, in this commemorative sacrifice, the real and bloody immolation of Jesus upon the cross, it was meet, that by a separate consecration and reception of the species of bread and wine, the real separa-

tion which had preceded, should be reproduced by the priest of Christ. Not so with the faithful. For, since the resurrection of Christ, His body, is impassible, and His blood can no longer be *really* separated from His flesh, so that, wherever His flesh is, there, also, is His blood; and *vice versa*, wherever His blood is, there also is His flesh. Hence, whoever receives either species, receives as much as he who receives both; and no wrong is done the laity, by refusing them the cup, or the species of wine. A familiar comparison may help to illustrate this doctrine. Suppose a mother distributes a certain quantity of bread and wine to her children. To one of them she gives it in a cup; to the other, in bread soaked in wine. Would the latter have a reasonable complaint against the mother on the supposition that the same quantity was not given to both? The comparison needs no application. He that receives the blood in the flesh, receives as much as he who would receive it apart from the flesh, and neither could possibly complain of wrong, or injustice.

Our divine Saviour promised, indeed, that He would give us His flesh to eat, and His blood to drink; but He did not determine the manner in which he would do so. Hence, the same Jesus who said: "unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you" (John vi. 54), also said: "he that shall eat of this bread, he shall live forever." (Ibid. 59.) And He that said, "whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath everlasting life," also said: "the bread which I give is My flesh, for the life of the world." Finally, He that said: "he who eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, abideth in Me, and I in him," also said: "he that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me." (*Vide* John, vi., *passim*.) And the Apostle St. Paul writes (according to the Greek version, which our separated brethren have corrupted in their English translation), "Whosoever shall eat this bread, *or* drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord."

In the Acts of the Apostles, chapter ii., 42, we read

that they "were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread and prayer,"—and in chapter xx., 7, "And on the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread" * * *

Yea, our Saviour Himself broke bread only in the castle of Emmaus, when seated at table, before His two disciples. (Luke xxiv. 30, 31.) This much must be conceded, that, in none of these instances the cup is mentioned.

Luther himself reproaches his disciple Carlstadt, for having introduced the practice of *communicating under both kinds*. (Epist. ad Gasp. Gustol.) And on another occasion (says Dr. Milner), he writes: "If a council did ordain or permit both kinds, in spite of the council, we would take but *one*, or take neither, and curse those who should take both." (Form. Miss. tom. ii. p. 384-386, apud Milner.)

The same Reformer writes (Epist. ad Boh.): "Although it may be well to use both kinds in the sacrament, yet Christ has commanded nothing on the subject." And again: "They sin not, who use but one kind, Christ having left this to the choice of each one." (Capt. Bab.)

Several Anglican bishops, such as Montague, Forbes, White, and others, held the doctrine that it was not essential to the sacrament to receive under both kinds.

The Calvinists of France, in their synod at Poitiers, in 1560, decreed thus: "The *bread* of our Lord's Supper ought to be administered to *those who cannot drink wine*, on their making a protestation that they do not refrain through contempt." (On the Lord's Supper, c. iii., p. 7, *ibid.*)

Lastly, by separate acts of that Parliament, and that king, who established the Protestant religion in England, and, by name, communion in both kinds, it is provided that the latter should only be *commonly so delivered and ministered*, and an exception is made, in case necessity did otherwise require. (Burnet's Hist. of Reform. v. ii., p. 41; Heylin, Hist. of Reform., p. 58.) It is clear, therefore, that our separated brethren did not always believe that communion under both kinds is an essential part of the sacrament.

There are natural reasons also, which must induce every sensible man to believe it not essential.

First, Christ knew that it would, in many instances, be difficult to obtain as much wine as would be necessary for distribution. There are countries, where the culture of the grape is impossible, and whither, for want of easy access, especially in days gone by, commerce would scarcely venture with this article.

Secondly, This species is more exposed than bread, to the influences of the atmosphere, and, therefore, less easily preserved in that condition which is necessary for the respect due to this sublime mystery.

Thirdly, It is more exposed to the wilful or involuntary irreverence of the receiver. It is more apt to spill, than bread is to crumble, or fall to the ground.

Fourthly, It is more difficult to carry it to sick persons.

Fifthly, There are not a few who are by nature so averse to wine, that they cannot possibly receive it.

Finally, The Church, which, from the beginning, taught the nature of this sacrament, must certainly also have known the manner of its reception. Now, her teaching and her practice are such, as clearly to prove that she never looked upon communion under both kinds, as essential to the sacrament, but merely as a matter of discipline, which might vary in local Churches, and in different times and circumstances. Her ecclesiastical historians tell us that, to the sick, she administered the sacrament under the species of bread only, as in the case of the venerable old man Serapion, who, according to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, c. 44), received from the hands of the priest the sacred food under species of bread only.

We are told the same by St. Paulinus, of St. Ambrose.

We know likewise from history, that holy communion was administered, during a certain period of the Church, to infants newly baptized, and they received the species of wine only.

In the days of persecution, when it was death to assemble for the purpose of celebrating the divine mysteries, the faithful were permitted to carry with them the blessed sacrament to their houses. But the historians of the time observe, that they carried with them the species of bread only. So did the hermits and monks in the desert receive under one species only, whenever the communion was brought to them from a distance.

“But is it not unworthy the majesty of the God-man

to lie concealed under the appearances of bread and wine; to be exposed to the neglect and contempt, raileries and insults of men; yea, to see himself trodden under foot, stabbed with dirks, and profaned by the very animals themselves!"

These sentiments of seeming respect for the dignity and sublimity of Christ's human nature would almost cause us to applaud the authors of them, were it not that they fall from lips which are the first to insult and sneer at that dignity in the sacrament. To draw an argument against the Real Presence from the possible indignities to which it may be exposed, is to assail the reality of the Incarnation and Redemption itself. Was it not unworthy the majesty of a God to *debase* Himself to the lowliness of a slave; to hide both His Divinity and Humanity, during nine long months, in a Virgin's womb; to be born in a stable; to be insulted by Scribe and Pharisee; to be scourged, crowned with thorns, to be nailed to an ignominious cross? Was it not possible, that the blood which He shed, at the pillar, or along the way to Calvary; that the flesh which was torn piecemeal from His limbs, should be trampled under the feet of His impious persecutors, or even lapped up by the tongue of vile animals? Did He on that account interrupt the course of His cruel sufferings? Ah, no! When He loved His own, He loved them till the end. So far from deeming these indignities unworthy of His nature, He foretold them in detail by His prophets, and loved to speak of them to His Apostles. What greater outrage could He receive in this very sacrament, than He received from one of His own disciples, who, at the very moment that he partook of the sacred species from the hands of his Master, was planning the means of betraying Him into the hands of His cruel enemies?

Finally, our adversaries charge us with idolatry in worshipping and adoring a wafer, as they contemptuously call the Blessed Sacrament.

To this Protestant objection let a Protestant answer. Jeremy Taylor, of the Anglican Church, writes as follows: "Idolatry is a forsaking of the true God, and giving divine worship to a creature, or to an idol, that is, to an imaginary God, who had no foundation in essence, or existence, and this is that kind of superstition, which by divines is called the superstition of an undue object. Now, it is evident that the object of the Catholic's adora-

tion (that which is represented to them in their minds, their thoughts, their purposes and which God principally, if not solely, takes estimate of human actions), in the Blessed Sacrament, is the only True and Eternal God, hypostatically joined with His Holy Humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veil of sacramental signs; and if they thought Him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread in that case, that they themselves profess it idolatry to do so, which is a demonstration that their soul hath nothing in it that is idolatrical." (Liberty of Prophesying, sect. 20, N. 16.) Our separated brethren, in their objection, forget the real nature of our doctrine. They forget that by the words of consecration we believe the substance of the bread and wine to be changed into the real body and blood of Jesus Christ, which, united—as these to His Soul and Divinity—form the sole object of their worship and adoration. Is it idolatry to adore Jesus Christ, true God and true man?

Nor is it an objection, that He is hidden under the sacramental veils, for was not Jesus as worthy of worship during the nine months that He lay hidden in the Virgin's womb, as He was when lying in the manger? Was He less worthy of adoration when the cloud took Him out of the disciples' view, than when He walked with them to the mountain of Olivet?

Moreover, this charge of idolatry implies more than objectors intend to express. If the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament is really an act of idolatry, then has the Church of Christ been idolatrous from the very days of the Apostles, and "Christ has dealt with His Church in a manner very unbecoming His goodness, which was to leave her, for fifteen hundred years together in such an error and idolatry, and that occasioned by His own words, as was never seen or heard of in the world." (Coster's Discourse.)

Can you believe that the Son of God should have come on earth only to exchange one error for another, one kind of idolatry for another? It is blasphemy to entertain the thought.

After all that has been said, our separated brethren may now, perhaps, understand what before seemed to them unintelligible, if not ridiculous. First of all, the difference between our, and their own public worship. When a Catholic enters any one of our churches, he has

scarcely passed the threshold, ere the eye of his faith directs the eyes of his body to the altar, and the tabernacle, in which his Lord and Master dwells. His first act is a genuflection, by which he adores his Lord and God. On entering his pew, he does not immediately seat himself and glance from worshipper to worshipper, to discover which of his friends or acquaintances have come to church; much less to discover the peculiar fashions which make their appearance on the occasion, but devoutly kneeling, he continues to adore the sole object of his love. Hence the profound stillness, interrupted only by the solemn chant of the priest or choir, during the celebration of the tremendous mysteries. Hence the pomp and grandeur of the liturgical rites, the richness of the sacerdotal robes, the splendor of gold, the beauty of precious stones, the fragrance of flowers and of incense.

Hence the celibacy of our clergy. Do you see that manly, noble, reverential form which stands at the foot of the altar, dressed in all the splendor of sacerdotal apparel? He is the son of a merchant-prince, the heir of millions. Scarcely had he finished his academic course, when, one bright morning, in anguish, he remained, after mass was over, kneeling in his pew, as if wrapped in ecstasy, and burning with charity. "Dear, sweet Jesus," whispered the youth, "Thou hast given me a heart to love. I feel the genial warmth of its flame. But, oh! the objects that surround me, in the world, and which would gain my heart, are loathing and disgusting to me. I cannot love flesh which is doomed to undergo the process of corruption; I cannot cherish blood which boils with the heat of unhallowed concupiscence. And yet, my youthful heart loves and yearns to love. But it would love Thee alone. Sweet Jesus, oh, that Thou wouldst allow me to espouse Thee, as the only object worthy of my love! Would that I might satisfy my desire, by daily standing at Thy altar, there to become united, in that most pure, chaste, and intimate manner, in which flesh can become united with flesh and blood with blood; grant me to minister within Thy sanctuary—make me, sweet Jesus, the dispenser of Thy mysteries, make me Thy priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedec." His prayer is heard, his vow is recorded in Heaven. Jesus has espoused the noble youth as His own forever. No, the love of Jesus in this

sacrament cannot allow the blending of the profane, carnal, with His holy, virginal love, in the ministers of this august, this thrice Holy Sacrament.

It is at the foot of the blessed Sacrament that our young maidens learned to devote themselves, by the most solemn and binding vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, to the service and imitation of their beloved Spouse. What has taught that beautiful, universally loved, and admired daughter of a Senator to go and shut herself up within the narrow confines of a convent-cell, to breathe away the fragrance of her youth in solitary contemplation and prayer! Desolate, afflicted mother, what brought that sister of charity by your side, at the moment your noble, patriotic boy, was pressing his farewell kisses on your tearful cheeks—what was it made her say, in her own gentle way: “Be comforted, weeping mother—behold, here am I to act a mother’s part. I shall follow your noble boy to the field of battle; I too shall be found upon the hard-contested field. And should a fatal bullet be sped from hostile gun, into his patriotic heart, I shall be there to extract the deadly missile, or close his dimming eyes in death. Under the open heavens—in the fetid atmosphere of the hospital—whatever fate betide him, I shall be there to wipe away his tears, to staunch his bleeding wounds, or prepare his soul for Heaven.” Where has she learned this heroic fortitude—this spirit of sacrifice? At the foot of her convent-altar—at the holy table where her soul fed so often on the bread of strength, on the wine of virgins. Far away from that altar, exposed to danger, with only a blanket to wrap around her weary frame,—like the soldier, on half rations—she regrets not the simple, yet soothing, comforts of home. The only loss she feels, is the absence of the daily sacrifice, and the frequent communions to which she was accustomed in her convent home.

Tell me, what inspired the master-mind of that architect, who raised yonder lofty temple to the name and glory of the God of Hosts? Who taught him to fling those vaulted arches, as if in rivalry with the Architect of the Universe, aloft in air? Whence did he learn to flute and hoist those towering columns, to crown them with their rich and varied foliage, in speaking stone and marble? From Him, who, however concealed, is to be present in the magnificent sanctuary of that temple, and

to make it His dwelling-place among the children of men.

Tell me, thou thousand-tongued organ, and ye thousand chorists, who blend your varied voices in perfect harmony with that instrument of magic sounds, who trained your authors and master's mind to this strange soul-ravishing melody? Who taught your Mozarts, your Haydns, your Cherubinis, your Le Sueurs, and your Lambillotes, the secret of their wondrous art? He who, although mute and silent in His earthly temple, sent the musical winds upon their noisy tour—who caused the stars to sing together—who filled the pine forest with the dirge-like notes of the plaintive winds—who caused the zephyrs to whisper to the flowers, and the rivulets to murmur to the rocks—who blent with all, as in a mighty fugue, the roar of the cataract, and the peal of the thunder!

To conclude: Who can tell all that our separated brethren have lost in losing the Real Presence? The food of their hungry souls—the drink of their thirsting hearts—their real comfort in affliction—their light in darkness—their counsellor in doubt—their strength in weakness—their shield and armor of defence, in danger—their hope in despondency—their life in death—their Jesus—their all. Oh! that they, like ourselves, could take once more this bread from Heaven—and know how sweet is the Lord; and having been their delight during life, oh! might it prove to them the sure pledge of everlasting life in Heaven'



OF AMERICA.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

PAMPHLETS AT NOMINAL COST.

POSTPAID.

-Refutation of Some Calumnies—Rev. J. C. Byrne, per.....	100...	\$1.00
-What Is The Use Of It?—Wm. Jefferson Guernsey, M. D., per.....	100...	1.00
-How Catholics come to be Misunderstood—Rev. Thos. O'Gorman, D. D., per.....	100...	2.00
-Who can Forgive Sins?—Rev. Patrick Danchy, per.....	100...	2.00
-Church or Bible—Rev. Arnold Damen, S. J., per.....	100...	2.00
-The Catholic Church and the American Republic— Wm. F. Markoe, per.....	100...	1.50
-Sacrificial Worship Essential to Religion—Rev. P. R. Heffron, D. D., per.....	100...	1.50
-The Catholic Pages of American History— J. L. Macdonald, per.....	100...	2.50
-Our Rights and Duties as Catholics and as Citizens— Wm. J. Onahan, per.....	100...	2.00
-Agnosticism—Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding, D. D., Bishop of Peoria, per.....	100...	2.00
-On The Condition of Labor—Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII, per.....	100...	2.50
-Purgatory—Rev. Henry A. Brann; D. D., per.....	100...	1.50
-Miracles—What are they, and what is their use?— Rev. John Gmeiner, per.....	100...	1.50
-The Conservative Power of Catholicity—Conde B. Pallen, per.....	100...	1.50
-How Christ Founded the Church—Rev. Jas. L. Meagher, per.....	100...	1.50
-The Claims of the Catholic Church in the Making of the Republic—His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons, D. D., per.....	100...	2.00
-The Real Presence—Rev. C. F. Smarius, S. J., per.....	100...	2.50
-Jesus Christ is God—Rev. Walter Elliott, per.....	100...	2.00
-Catholicity and The American Mind—George Parsons Lathrop, per.....	100...	1.50
-Were the Middle Ages Dark?—Rt. Rev. T. F. Brennan, D. D., Bishop of Dallas, Texas, per.....	100...	2.00
-Indulgences—Rt. Rev. John J. Kain, D. D., Bishop of Wheeling, per.....	100...	1.00
-Where is Religious Truth?—R. G. Rives, per.....	100...	1.50
-The Invocation of Saints—Rev. E. McSweeney, D. D., per.....	100...	1.50
assorted Lots of 100, same ratio.		
at "A"—Things Catholics do not Believe, per.....	100...15c, 1000...	\$1.00
at "B"—Catholic Converts, per.....	100...25c, 1000...	2.00
at "C"—A Fearful Responsibility, per.....	100...15c, 1000...	1.00

For larger quantities of the Pamphlets are desired, the same should be sent by express, up to 600 copies; more than 600, to distant points, and go by freight.

Please send funds with orders for postpaid quantities.

For O. B. quantities, to be sent by express or freight, range from 20c. per 100 under postpaid rates.

Single copies by mail 5c.; any seven, at any time, by mail 25c.

Ample copies mailed free, to the Rev. clergy, upon application.

Address,

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY,

218 East Third Street, ST. PAUL, MINN.

The pamphlets published by the C. T. S. are but brief, simple aids towards the removal of prejudice regarding Catholicity. More complete instruction can be found in "The Faith of our Fathers," "Catholicism," "Rational Religion," "Points of Controversy," "Notes on Ingersoll," etc., to be obtained of Catholic and other book sellers.



OF
AMERICA